

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10 and 19-24 remain pending in the present application. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-8, 10 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) because the Applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. In the Examiner's Answer, this rejection was withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iritani, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,526,650) in view of JP 6-40249. Claims 3 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied to Claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of JP 6-270645 or JP 7-69045. Claims 6, 19, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied to Claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of JP 5-124426. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (assuming the 102(f) rejection is overcome).

Claim 4 depended from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 4 and Claim 4 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 3, 5-8

and 19 which ultimately depend from Claim 1 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The rejections of Claims 10 and 20-24 have been withdrawn by the Examiner in his Answer to Applicants' Appeal Brief.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 1, 2004

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg